

## REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 2-6 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In response thereto, an amendment has been made to claim 2. Amendments are also made to claims 15 and 40 to correct similar deficiencies.

Claims 1-46 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-46, respectively, of copending Application No. 10/154,947. Claim 1 was rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 6 of copending Application No. 10/956,172. Finally, claims 1-4 and 7-13 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4 and 10-16, respectively, of copending Application No. 10/390,366. A terminal disclaimer will be submitted to overcome these rejections should the rejections become non-provisional.

The undersigned attorney believes that all claims are now allowable and a notice of allowance is courteously solicited. Please direct any questions to the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 8, 2005

By:     /Bruce E. Garlick/      
Bruce E. Garlick, Reg. 36,520

**Garlick, Harrison & Markison, LLP**  
P.O. Box 160727  
Austin, Texas 78716-0727  
(512) 264-8816  
(512) 264-3735 fax